

August 15, 1975 - Approved For Release : CIA-RDP75-00149R000400430020-2

But, states the editorial:

Congress is not qualified to legislate the details of foreign policy implementation, and shouldn't try.

I agree, at least, in an instance such as this.

The editorial continues:

As the Middle East crisis and renewed guerrilla fighting in Latin America demonstrate, this is still a dangerous world. There are many cases where supply of U.S. weapons is vitally important. And, in some instances, the transactions cannot be broadcast from the rooftops.

Surely, that is a sound statement. We ought not to shear away what might be a vital authority of the President to make his decisions on questions of sales of U.S. weapons.

I am not going to place the man in the White House in a straitjacket. I want the Senate to correct the mistake of the Committee on Foreign Relations when it voted to strike out the Pentagon revolving fund for defensive arms sales.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial, entitled "Congress Misguided on Arms," printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CONGRESS MISGUIDED ON ARMS

Members of Congress who should know better seem determined to hamstring the Executive Branch in its handling of delicate foreign policy situations.

The lawmakers' motives are good, but their actions are nonetheless unwise and potentially dangerous to the U.S. national interest.

In both House and Senate, the Banking and Currency committees have been threatening to abolish the authority of the Export-Import Bank to finance sales of American arms to underdeveloped countries.

Now the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has jumped into the act by voting to gradually eliminate the revolving fund which the "Ex-Im" maintains for Pentagon arms transactions.

If this action is upheld by the full House and Senate, the effect will be either to put the Defense Department out of the weapons supply business—or to force the Administration into even more secretive handling of weapons supply agreements, through inclusion in the CIA budget or otherwise.

The congressional moves are well intended. They grow, for one thing, out of a growing conviction that the United States should avoid allowing military aid programs to get this country committed to any more Vietnam-type situations.

They also reflect a feeling that the arms are used, all too often, for purposes at odds with overall U.S. foreign policy. Pakistan's use of American weapons against India, and the similar employment of U.S. arms against Israel by Jordan are typical of the problem.

Finally, many lawmakers feel that the Pentagon has used the device of "Country-X" loans from the Ex-Im to make arms deals without the knowledge of Congress.

All three concerns are legitimate. If the current furor induces the Administration to take a more skeptical and hard-eyed view of arms purchase requests, and to keep Congressional committees properly informed, a useful purpose will have been served.

It would be a mistake, nevertheless, for Congress to write rigid restrictions that would endanger the intelligent and flexible conduct of foreign policy.

As the Middle East crisis and renewed guerrilla fighting in Latin America demonstrate, this is still a dangerous world. There

are many cases where supply of U.S. weapons is vitally important. And, in some instances, the transactions cannot be broadcast from the rooftops.

It should be remembered that there has been no massive increase in the flow of U.S. arms to developing countries. But weapons which previously were given away are now sold—with a credit boost from the Ex-Im. The taxpayers benefit thereby.

Congress is not qualified to legislate the details of foreign policy implementation, and shouldn't try.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have joined in support of the pending amendment. I am certainly not a merchant of arms, nor am I interested in helping merchants of arms, but everything said by the distinguished Senator from Missouri is tied to the fact that this Government will do it.

When the Senator from Washington spoke of tying our hands, it is one thing to fight about it administratively—and we can have our way when we want it—but it is another thing to have no statutory authority. In my judgment, the pattern of the security of this Nation, and of the world, requires greater flexibility in this matter than is vouchsafed to the President by the bill as it came from committee.

I shall take my chances on our ability to control excesses of judgment by the Defense Secretary, or the President, but I will not take my chances to deny them the statutory authority within which to deal with existing world situations which so directly relate to our security.

That is why I join in support of the amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield 8 minutes to the Senator from Idaho.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, this is a policy matter which properly belongs, I should think, to the Committee on Foreign Relations. The committee did not come to its decision hastily. This has been brewing for years. This year alone, two separate subcommittees held hearings for our foreign military assistance which we have been slapping on with such eager hands.

The committee does not take the position that there should be no military assistance. The committee asks only that the military assistance program be administered with discrimination and restraint, focused on those countries where our national interest clearly calls for it. But the fact is that the program has been proliferated, bureaucratized, and routinized in such fashion that most foreign countries are now offered military assistance as a part of the regular package.

A few weeks ago, in summarizing how far this has gone, I called the attention of the Senate to the fact that, since 1950, we have disbursed \$37 billion worth of military assistance abroad.

The total amount is not only staggering, but listen to the list of armaments involved: 3,292 aircraft trainers, 4,385 F-84 fighters, 2,812 F-86 aircraft trainers, 25,279 tanks, 75,995 trailers, 150,552 2½-ton trucks, 1,382,000 carbines,

2,106,000 rifles, 72,777 machineguns, 29,716 mortars, and over 30,000 missiles.

Today we are disbursing abroad a greater volume of arms than all the other industrial countries combined, and six times the volume of our nearest rival, the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, this is, therefore, a question of policy. When I spoke to the Senate some weeks ago, I tried to point out where the policy has backfired, with the most regrettable results for the United States.

We eagerly supplied arms both to Pakistan and India, in the name of better enabling those two countries to defend themselves against the Soviet Union. But Pakistan knew, all along, that the arms would have utility only against India. In the end, arms we supplied were used both by India and Pakistan in the war between them.

It was the Soviet Union, against whom we had intended the arms to point, which then stepped in at Tashkent as the minister of peace.

We have seen our arms policy backfire in the Middle East, where both Arab and Israel troops, only 2 months ago, were armed with American tanks, when the war came.

We have seen some \$325 million of our arms disbursed to the Arab countries surrounding Israel, whose avowed purpose was to drive the Israelis into the sea.

Yes, gentlemen, this is a policy question.

Now it has been argued that if the committee is not overruled, the President's hands will be tied, and that our capacity to continue to furnish arms either on a grant or credit basis to foreign countries will be seriously impaired.

Gentlemen, that is not so.

Let me review the provisions in the present law enabling foreign governments to procure arms from the United States:

First. They can buy directly from U.S. manufacturers on whatever credit terms they may be able to negotiate with private banks or with the Export-Import Bank.

Second. They can buy weapons and supplies from Department of Defense stocks, with up to 3 years credit, under the provisions of section 507(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act.

Third. They can buy through an arrangement where the Department of Defense in effect, acts as their purchasing agent in contracting with private suppliers. The Department of Defense is reimbursed by the country for the equipment it obtains for them.

Fourth. They can obtain military equipment on a grant basis, under section 614 of the Foreign Assistance Act which gives the President authority to use up to \$250 million to assist a country when "important to the security of the United States" if that country is "a victim of active Communist or Communist-supported aggression." Arms aid was given to six countries under this authority in the last fiscal year.

Fifth. They can obtain military equipment on a grant basis through the military assistance program as authorized by the Foreign Assistance Act.